



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,903	07/11/2000	Heather J. Jordan	IVGN 187.1 CON	1446
65482	7590	07/31/2007	EXAMINER	
INVITROGEN CORPORATION			SISSON, BRADLEY L	
C/O INTELLEVATE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 52050			1634	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/613,903	JORDAN, HEATHER J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	/Bradley L. Sisson/	1634	

All Participants:

Status of Application: 71

(1) Bradley L. Sisson.

(3) _____.

(2) Peter Foiles, Reg. No. 46,477.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 July 2007

Time: 11:15

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

85-93, 105-113, and 125

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Sisson noted that in applicant's response of 02 July 2007, Mr. Foiles had directed attention to page 9, lines 8-9, of the specification as providing a definition of "substantially equal relative mass." Mr. Sisson inquired if it was applicant's intention to have the different masses of fragments that comprise the different rungs of the nucleic acid ladder to all be within a factor of 3, or whether some other interpretation was intended. Mr. Sisson noted that if the definition was to be applied across all of the different fragment sizes, then seemingly claims 86-93 and 106-113 do not further limit claims 85 and 105 from which they depend.

Mr. Foiles indicated that the factor of 3 was to be applied to a specific band or rung, and not necessarily to multiple rungs of the ladder.

In response to inquiry by Mr. Sisson as to how claim 125, in light of the definition provided at page 9, lines 8-9, of the disclosure, further limited claim 85, Mr. Foiles indicated that claim 125 would be canceled.

Mr. Sisson inquired as to how the mass of the nucleic acid fragments was being determined, and if it also included the mass of any labels that may be attached thereto. Mr. Sisson indicated that the claims would seemingly encompass a ladder where some fragments may be labeled and other fragments are not labeled.

Mr. Foiles indicated that a supplemental response would be electronically filed within the next week, clarifying the above aspects .